

Radiation

Safety

Committee

Minutes of Sub-Committee review of April 18, 2000

Review of Topics Related to Operation of RHIC with
Controlled Berm

Present: L. Ahrens, D. Beavis, W. Mackay, E. Lessard, C. Schaefer, A. Stevens

This meeting consisted of reviewing the status of control of the RHIC berm and RSC checklist items relating to operation with the berm designated as a 'Controlled Area.' These checklist items are reported in the Minutes of the meeting of February 8, 2000.

The first checklist item is CK-RHIC-startup2-01, which called for an operations procedure specifying how beam loss would be controlled to meet the specifications of both a controlled area and the Operational Safety Limits for RHIC. Ed Lessard and Leif Ahrens reported that the first version of this procedure already exists. This procedure scales the allowed injected beam per hour for the uncontrolled berm situation up by a factor of 10. The plan is to incrementally increase this limit with procedure modifications as both the need for increased beam and the ability to account for beam loss (e.g. after the beam abort system is commissioned) exists. The sub-committee regards this checklist item as satisfied, but the RSC would like to review proposed changes to the current procedure prior to implementation.

CK-RHIC-startup2-02 calls for signed drawings to exist prior to taking credit for the fence. D. Passarello will initiate this process. A. Stevens will sign for the RSC.

CK-RHIC-startup2-03 calls for the fence to be posted. C. Schaefer and A. Stevens confirmed that posting on the 'C-A part' of the fence (5 ft. high) is completed. High Laboratory Management has decided, with the approval of Steve Layendecker, that the Security fence (8 ft. high topped with barbed wire) is a sufficient barrier that it need not be posted. The subcommittee accedes to this decision.

CK-RHIC-startup2-04 and 2-05 both refer to posting at access points. The sub-committee considers the current posting (especially large at access points along roads) as satisfactory. Stevens reported that the personnel access openings in the 5 ft. fence are generally 5 ft. wide, and are draped with chains (which was a part of the contract) with 'S' hooks for easy disconnect. The sub-committee had no objection to this situation.

Schaefer stated that a snow fence, which had previously been in the Peconic River sections of the security fence, has been removed to allow the completion of the Security fence, now that the needed permits are in hand. The RSC will consider the berm to be controlled when the Security fence is completed and the fence drawing signed.